

is expecting to be out of power shortly. He keeps putting more of these unelected persons in there to stay there until they are 75 years of age. He appointed Staff Barootes, Finlay MacDonald, Brenda Robertson, a former Minister in the "Hashfield" government. He appointed Richard Doyle, former *Globe and Mail* editor, a staunch supporter of Bill C-22. He appointed Paul David, Jean-Maurice Simard and Michel Cogger. Yes, Michel Cogger is in there, and right from the late and lamented blue machine comes Norm Atkins, and there is Myra Spivak, the wife of former Manitoba P.C. Leader, and Jean Bazin. Hot dog! And all of them are going to stay until they are 75 years of age. And when the New Democratic Party forms the Government after the next election, they will be trying to put the boots to good socialist legislation.

Ms. Mitchell: Do you think the Tories would do that?

Mr. Rodriguez: They are criticizing the Liberals for doing it to Bill C-22 while at the same time they are appointing their own hench people. The Minister called them "hacks and flacks". Would I dare to show such disrespect? Absolutely not. I would not call them such names.

I did not come here to praise the other place. I am not here to do that. I would not dare to presume to do such a thing about such worthies. But why would some of those people oppose Bill C-22? For example, I have a question in mind. Why would Ian Sinclair do that? If ever there was a person who knows the corporate world and is part of it, it is he. In fact, he is an extension of all his buddies over at the Rideau Club. Why would he oppose something that his corporate brethren all want? Would those worthies oppose it unless they really felt that Bill C-22 was going a little too far? Surely, they cannot be accused of putting politics before self-interest. So we have to ask ourselves if they are sincerely responding with fair criticisms about Bill C-22.

Before I ask myself that question I should look at some of those criticisms. It is not just the other place and it is not just New Democrats. There was an editorial in *The Financial Post* entitled "Drugs and Trade" which stated:

The Senate Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee's recommendations only sharpen the Bill's purpose, that it might at least achieve what it intends.

Who said that? Who wrote this article? It is from *The Financial Post* on October 26, 1987.

Mr. Heap: Do you read those vicious socialist papers?

● (1840)

Mr. Rodriguez: I have to know what they are up to. The only way to know what they are up to is to read their papers. This is an editorial that takes to task Bill C-22.

Here is another one entitled "If Cabinet serious about C-22 Andre should be put on leash". It is from *The Globe and Mail* of November 2, 1987, written by a writer named Hugh Winsor. That article states this:

Patent Act

So if the Government says the prices board will keep drug price increases below the rate of inflation, Senator Sinclair wants to ensure that by tying the price increase to the consumer price index.

In other words what the Minister says the Bill does very softly, the other place says, "Well, let us write that in as an amendment to the Bill". That sounds fair.

Here is another one. It is entitled, "Drug companies should consider compromise". It is from *The Gazette* of Montreal dated October 30, 1987. It is an article written by Peter Hadekel.

Then we have another article entitled, "Senate overdose". It is an editorial out of *The Ottawa Citizen* of October 27, 1987. It states in this editorial:

No matter how meddlesome the unelected Senate may be, the government's problems with this bill do not begin and end in the upper chamber. They begin with a piece of legislation that flies in the face of public opinion, conservative ideology and common sense.

Here is a paper, Mr. Speaker, that really stretches the limits of one's imagination as criticizing the Conservative Government. It is entitled, "Upper downer". It is an editorial from *The Toronto Sun*, and I quote from that real left wing paper, "Harvie Andre's outrage with the Senate rings more than a little false in our ears".

Mr. McCurdy: Say it again.

Mr. Rodriguez: "Harvie Andre's outrage with the Liberal Senate rings more than a little false in our ears". From *The Toronto Star* I quote from an article entitled, "Let's not swallow bad medicine bill". It states in part:

Such obstructionism, if it continues, merely invites the Tories to campaign for re-election on a promise to clip the Senate's wings. That would divert public attention from the real issue: a bad drug patent bill.

Here is another left wing editorial from the *Winnipeg Free Press* entitled, "Fine-tuning the polls" which states:

Should anyone be surprised at the news that a poll commissioned by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association of Canada has discovered that "82 per cent of Canadians support patent protection for pharmaceutical products, along with a system which limits the price increases of drugs to the rate of inflation"?

Are you surprised, Mr. Speaker? That is the result of that poll.

I want to say to the Government which is trying to get this Bill through the House, and which through the constitutional processes of the Houses of Parliament has been hung up on the fence of political protocol, where I hope it stays forever, that it should really take a hard look at it. Is the Bill really serving the interests of consumers or is it simply satisfying the friends of the Government both here and in Washington?

Mr. McCurdy: They have more down there.

Mr. Rodriguez: Is that the reason? After all, the Minister has claimed that the the pharmaceutical companies would be prepared to spend all this money for expansion and research and development. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the